

AD-A103 919

COGNITIVE PRINCIPLES FOR INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN(U)
CALIFORNIA UNIV BERKELEY SCHOOL OF EDUCATION F REIF
JUL 87 CES-5 N00014-83-K-0598

1/1

UNCLASSIFIED

F/G 12/9

NL



July 1987

Report No. CES-5 ✓

DTIC FILE COPY

AD-A183 919

Cognitive Principles for Instructional Design

Final Report on ONR contract # N00014-83-K-0598
(August 1983-February 1987)

F. Reif

Department of Physics and School of Education ✓
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

DTIC
ELECTE
AUG 3 1 1987
S D
C&D

The work reported here was primarily supported by the Personnel and Training Research Programs, Psychological Sciences Division, Office of Naval Research, under contract No. N00014-83-K-0598, contract authority No. NR 154-522.

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited. Reproduction in whole or part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

87 8 26 084

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

AD-A183919

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

| | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|--|---|--------------------------|
| 1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified | | | 1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS | | |
| 2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY | | | 3. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited | | |
| 2b. DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE | | | | | |
| 4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) CES-5 | | | 5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) | | |
| 6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION University of California | | 6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) | 7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION Personnel and Training Research Programs Office of Naval Research (Code 1142 PT) | | |
| 6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Berkeley, CA 94720 | | | 7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 800 North Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217-5000 | | |
| 8a. NAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING ORGANIZATION | | 8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) | 9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER N00014-83-0598 | | |
| 8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) | | | 10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS | | |
| | | | PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. 61153N | PROJECT NO. RR04206 | TASK NO. RR04206-1 |
| | | | WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO. | | |
| 11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Cognitive Principles for Instructional Design (unclassified) | | | | | |
| 12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) F. Reif | | | | | |
| 13a. TYPE OF REPORT Final | | 13b. TIME COVERED FROM 83/8 TO 87/2 | | 14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1987, July | |
| 15. PAGE COUNT 19 | | | | | |
| 16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION | | | | | |
| 17. COSATI CODES | | | 18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) | | |
| FIELD | GROUP | SUB-GROUP | | | |
| | | | Instruction, learning, science, concepts. | | |
| | | | | | |
| 19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) | | | | | |
| <p>→ This final report summarizes briefly work done to formulate and test some cognitively-based principles useful for designing instruction in scientific or engineering fields. These principles stress particularly the coherence and interpretability of the knowledge acquired by students. The principles were specifically applied to analyze the underlying knowledge and thought processes needed to interpret scientific concepts effectively; to investigate how actual experts and novice students interpret such concepts; and to devise and test instruction designed to teach such concepts more effectively. Attempts were also made to devise computational environments to explore and implement these instructional ideas. <i>Keywords:</i></p> | | | | | |
| 20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS | | | 21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION unclassified | | |
| 22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Dr. Susan Chipman | | 22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) 202/696-4318 | | 22c. OFFICE SYMBOL ONR 1142PT | |

Abstract

This final report summarizes briefly work done to formulate and test some cognitively-based principles useful for designing instruction in scientific or engineering fields. These principles stress particularly the coherence and interpretability of the knowledge acquired by students. The principles were specifically applied to analyze the underlying knowledge and thought processes needed to interpret scientific concepts effectively; to investigate how actual experts and novice students interpret such concepts; and to devise and test instruction designed to teach such concepts more effectively. Attempts were also made to devise computational environments to explore and implement these instructional ideas.



| | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Accession For | |
| NTIS | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| CRA&I | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| DTIC | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| TAB | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Unannounced <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Justification | |
| By | |
| Distribution/ | |
| Availability Codes | |
| Dist | Avail and/or Special |
| A-1 | |

Introduction

The goal of this project was to formulate and test some cognitively-based principles for designing instruction in complex domains, such as science or engineering.

These instructional principles were to be based upon the following: (a) An analysis of the underlying knowledge and thought processes needed for good performance in the particular domain of interest. (b) An adequate understanding of the knowledge and thought processes of students coming to the learning situation. The instructional process would then be explicitly designed to transform a student's knowledge and thinking so as to approximate those needed for good performance.

To implement the project, it was planned to focus on a subject-matter domain which would be sufficiently limited in scope to be investigated in some detail, but which would be representative of the complexities encountered in broader realms of science or engineering. Accordingly, we chose to devote primary attention to the interpretation and learning of scientific or mathematical concepts (such as the physics concept "acceleration"). Indeed, an adequate understanding of such concepts is of fundamental importance to any scientific work and is an essential prerequisite for any problem solving in scientific domains. The learning of such concepts presents many difficulties for students and conventional teaching methods are often quite ineffective.

In carrying out our work, we were centrally interested in obtaining information sufficiently detailed to elucidate underlying thought processes and to assess the ways in which they would be affected by specific instructional interventions. Accordingly, we concentrated our efforts on detailed observations of individual subjects under controlled conditions.

General Theoretical Considerations

Analysis of desirable performance

Our basic criterion for ultimately desired intellectual performance is that a person's knowledge should be effectively usable so that it can be applied correctly and flexibly in a wide range of situations.

This performance criterion is far from trivial. Indeed, all too commonly the knowledge acquired by students as a result of ordinary instruction is merely "nominal"; i.e., it can be displayed by students on standard examination questions, but cannot be used flexibly by them to enhance their capabilities of independent thinking.

The criterion of effective usability raises the following theoretical questions: What are some of the essential characteristics needed to make knowledge about some topic effectively usable? Our analysis suggested that the following characteristics are of central importance:

(1) The topical knowledge must be accompanied by ancillary knowledge ensuring that the topical knowledge can be properly interpreted. Such interpretation knowledge must specify how to instantiate the topical knowledge in any particular case, and how to determine whether such instantiation is correct or not. (Such interpretation is clearly an essential prerequisite for more complex problem solving.)

(2) The form of the knowledge, i.e., its description and organization, is at least as important as its content to ensure that the knowledge is effectively usable. In particular, it is essential that the knowledge is adequately coherent, i.e., that knowledge elements are interconnected by possible (strict or plausible) inferences among them. Such coherence greatly facilitates ease of remembering, ease of regenerating knowledge that has been forgotten, ease of ensuring consistency, ease of debugging, and ease of extending the knowledge by generalization or new learning.

(3) Available knowledge needs to be accompanied by adequate control knowledge. (a) Such control needs to ensure proper invocation, implementation, and checking when available knowledge is applied. (Indeed, particularly in science, disciplined knowledge application is a prerequisite for accurate and flexible knowledge use.) (b) Deliberate and automatic control of knowledge must be well-integrated. Indeed, performance of a complex task would be very difficult unless some lower-level knowledge can be used nearly automatically in ways that are fast and effortless (so as to leave adequate mental capacity available for the performance of more complex aspects of the task).

Instructional implications

The preceding considerations lead to the following general instructional implications:

(1) Instruction should be designed so as to explicitly ensure that any knowledge acquired by students have the preceding characteristics needed for good performance.

(2) Learning can be facilitated by maximizing these characteristics at any intermediate stage of the learning process. (For example, care devoted to keeping any newly acquired knowledge interpretable and coherent can appreciably facilitate extension of this knowledge by further learning.)

The following paragraphs summarize briefly how we tried to implement and investigate these general theoretical guidelines in the specific domain of scientific concepts

Analysis of Concept Interpretation

An essential task in dealing with any scientific or mathematical concept (such as "acceleration", "area", ...) involves the ability to interpret this concept so as to instantiate it properly in any specific case. This interpretation task is actually more complex than one might naively suspect.

To interpret such a concept one must retrieve from memory some knowledge stored about the concept, and then engage in information processing to apply this knowledge in the particular situation of interest. Different possible modes of concept interpretation are then possible, depending on the kind of knowledge stored in memory and the kind of processing done with it. Each of these possible modes has some distinctive characteristics, in terms of unambiguity, precision, generality, and ease of use. Correspondingly, each of them can also lead to distinctive kinds of errors.

We performed an analysis, buttressed by some observations, of various possible modes of concept interpretation and their implications. In brief, these modes of interpretation can be classified into the following two types:

(1) Some interpretation modes are "formal", i.e., deliberately designed to achieve great precision and generality. They store in memory well-specified and general definitional knowledge about the concept, knowledge which must then be explicitly processed to be applied in any specific instance. The knowledge stored may be a "declarative specification" of features characterizing the concept; the processing needed for application in particular instances may then require appreciable problem solving. Alternatively, it may be a "procedural specification" which provides a more detailed and explicit specification of how to interpret the concept in any particular instance. Such formal interpretation modes have the advantage of being reliably accurate, precise, and general. They have the disadvantage that their application is slow and requires significant mental effort.

(2) Other interpretation modes are based on a repertoire of case-based knowledge.. The knowledge stored in memory consists then of knowledge about various special cases, standard cases, and typical kinds of cases of the concept. If this knowledge has become compiled as a result of familiarity and repeated use, such knowledge can then be invoked almost automatically by recognition processes that match this knowledge with any particular instance of interest. These non-formal case-based interpretation modes have the advantage of efficiency, i.e., they can be applied quickly and effortlessly. They have the disadvantage that they can easily lead to errors or inconsistencies, and are not well suited for making general inferences.

What then is an "ideal" mode of concept interpretation which is both reliably effective and efficient? The preceding analysis suggests that such an ideal mode of concept interpretation should rely on both formal and case-based knowledge used in complementary ways. If one encounters a familiar situation, it is most efficient to use case-based knowledge, and then to rely on more

formal knowledge to check the resulting interpretation if necessary. On the other hand, if one encounters an unfamiliar situation, tries to detect or diagnose errors or inconsistencies, or needs to make general arguments, then it is most useful to rely on formal knowledge and to use case-based knowledge for possible check-points.

An account of the preceding work was published as an ONR report (Reif, 1986). An article based on this work has also been accepted for publication in the journal Cognitive Science (in press).

Comparative Studies of Good and Poor Performance

To obtain data bearing on the characteristics of usable knowledge, and more specifically on the preceding analysis of effective and efficient concept interpretation, we made some detailed observations to elucidate the nature of the underlying knowledge and thought processes used by persons who were either good or poor interpreters of scientific concepts.

To this end, we (predominantly Lisa Quinn and I) constructed two carefully designed sets of questions requiring persons to interpret the concept "acceleration" qualitatively in a variety of situations. The persons used in this experimental investigation were either physics professors who had recently taught an introductory mechanics course dealing with the concept "acceleration", or students enrolled in such a course. Each such person was individually asked to talk out loud about his or her thinking while trying to answer the questions — once without interventions by the experimenter, and a second time with requests for fuller explanations of his or her thinking. The transcript of the person's tape-recorded utterances, together with his or her written work, constituted then a protocol which was subsequently analyzed in detail.

Good experts

Those experts (i.e., physics professors) who are good at interpreting the scientific concept seem to behave in a manner similar to that proposed by our ideal model of concept interpretation. (a) They can interpret reliably the knowledge invoked by them. (b) Their knowledge is quite coherent, i.e., consistent and usable for various inferences. (c) They have both formal and case-based knowledge, and they use both these kinds of knowledge in complementary fashion.

However, even these good experts (who answer correctly more than 90% of all questions given to them) occasionally make mistakes. Many of these are due to the experts' inadequate control of their available knowledge (e.g. to failure to invoke appropriate knowledge, even when it was recently invoked in a slightly different context, or failure to check adequately application of this knowledge).

Novice students

Even when students are currently enrolled in a course where they have studied and repeatedly applied the concept "acceleration" for more than a couple of months, their ability to interpret this concept is quite poor. In our investigation, these students were unable to answer correctly about 60% of the qualitative questions about this concept.

Analysis of the protocols reveals that students' underlying knowledge about this concept has the following major characteristics:

(1) Their knowledge is quite incoherent, consisting largely of various disconnected knowledge fragments (many of them incorrect).. As a result, students are often unable to deal with situations deviating slightly from standard situations previously encountered by them; they fail to detect inconsistencies; and they encounter paradoxes which they cannot resolve.

(2) Correct concept interpretation, relying on on many such fragmentary knowledge elements, would require that each such knowledge element be accompanied by specific applicability conditions. However, not surprisingly, students often either fail to store adequately such applicability conditions, or fail to retrieve them when invoking a knowledge element.

(3) Students rarely invoke general formal knowledge and are often unable to articulate such knowledge. Furthermore, when they do invoke such knowledge, they are frequently unable to interpret it and thus cannot apply it successfully in particular instances.

In short, students' knowledge seems to lack most of the characteristics of interpretability and coherence which we have identified as essential to the effective usability of knowledge.

Nominal versus good experts

There are "nominal" experts (so designated by criteria such as title, position, degrees, or other credentials) whose actual performance is not particularly good. Hence it is important to specify whether nominal criteria or actual performance data are used to select "experts" in any comparative study of experts or novices. For example, in our experiments we found "experts" (i.e., physics faculty members at a university") who were not good at interpreting an elementary concept, like "acceleration", which they themselves had recently taught.. Indeed, their performance was partly reminiscent of that of novices. Such observations have not only sociological, but also cognitive interest. In particular, one can try to trace the performance deficiencies of such experienced persons to specific deficiencies in the form of their underlying knowledge.

Some results of these comparative studies of good and poor performance have been summarized in a recently published paper (Reif, 1987). We hope to present a more extensive account in a future publication.

Instructional Studies

The preceding theoretical ideas and observations about the essential characteristics of flexibly usable knowledge suggest some specific guidelines for the design of instruction.

Working with myself and Lisa Quinn, Peter Labudde (a postdoctoral visitor from Switzerland) carried out an instructional experiment to test some of these ideas. To be specific, we wanted to investigate the instructional efficacy of implementing merely the following two design guidelines based on our cognitive considerations: (a) Ensure explicitly the coherence and interpretability of newly acquired knowledge. (b) Ensure that this new knowledge is also coherent with students' preexisting knowledge, and can be used to debug this knowledge.

To implement these guidelines for the teaching of a new concept ("acceleration"), the instructional intervention did the following: (a) It taught students an explicit procedural specification of the concept acceleration and then gave students some practice in applying this procedure in several diverse situations. (Specification of the concept in terms of a procedure was designed to make the new knowledge interpretable. The consistent application of this single procedure to all cases was intended to make the new knowledge highly coherent.) (b) It then asked students to use this procedural specification to detect, diagnose, and correct errors previously committed by themselves or errors purportedly committed by others. (By having to use their newly acquired coherent knowledge to confront their own prior notions or other common misconceptions, students were supposed to restructure their entire knowledge in coherent form. They were also thereby learning quality-control needed to detect and correct deficiencies in their new and preexisting knowledge.)

The instructional intervention in this experiment lasted about half an hour and resulted in the following main outcomes: (a) Students' abilities to interpret the concept acceleration improved markedly, from about 40% correct interpretations in a pretest before the instruction, to about 95% correct in a posttest after the instruction. (b) In their attempts to interpret the concept acceleration, students invoked many incorrect knowledge elements before the instruction, but invoked essentially no incorrect knowledge elements after the instruction. (c) Students' interpretation of the concept after the instruction was both effective and efficient. In simple situations, they relied on compiled knowledge about special cases of the acceleration; but in more complex situations, they reverted to the procedural specification to interpret the concept, or to check tentative answers based on compiled knowledge.

In both its explicitness and emphasis on the form of the knowledge acquired by students, this instructional intervention differs significantly from the common methods used to teach scientific concepts. The results of this instructional experiment were also certainly encouraging, although not definitive. In particular, this instructional experiment incorporated only a few central design principles identified by our analysis; additional tests of instructional efficacy would also be desirable.

An account of the preceding work on instruction was published as an ONR report (Labudde, Reif, & Quinn, 1987). An article based on this work has also been accepted for publication in the European Journal of Science Education (in press).

Computer-Implemented Instruction

Advantages of using computers

There are many reasons why the use of computers would be advantageous in formulating, testing, and implementing instructional design principles of the kind discussed in the preceding paragraphs. The reasons include the following:

Research on instruction can be made more rigorous by translating instructional designs into the form of instructional computer programs. (a) Such programs serve to make more explicit the assumptions incorporated in an instructional model. (b) They allow the testing of such models under controlled conditions where the successive actions of the student and the computer tutor are well-specified and well-known.

The computer has some unique advantages as a medium. (a) It can provide powerful graphical representations, including dynamic representations of physical phenomena and of the student's own thought processes. (For example, a dynamic graphical representation may be used to portray a student's own progress in carrying out a procedure.) (b) The computer can easily store and then redisplay a student's past work on an intellectual task. Thus it allows the student to reflect on his or her past thinking — and also more easily to detect, diagnose, and correct his or her previous deficiencies. (c) With careful design, computers can provide an environment where students can actively explore new concepts while being constrained to behave in disciplined ways.

Finally, computers would be very valuable for delivering practical instruction. If students are to acquire scientific knowledge that is actually usable, it is imperative that they become actively engaged in the process of constructing their own knowledge. The computer can help by providing exploratory environments and by playing the role of private individual tutor. By contrast, most usual teaching environments fail partly because they put students in passive roles where they spend most of their time merely listening or reading.

Difficulties of computer implementation

The previous appealing advantages of using computers are, however, not readily realizable because of several major difficulties — all of which became very evident in our work during this project.

Some of these difficulties involve computer hardware. The implementation of instructional designs, of the kind discussed in the previous paragraphs, requires computers which sufficiently powerful to handle text, graphics, and good student response judging. At the time when we first tried to use computers for this project, Apple Macintosh computers just became available and seemed barely adequate to satisfy our requirements. Only much later did we gain access to a few much more powerful Xerox-1108 workstations. But the software available on relatively new machines is limited. Furthermore, one quickly discovers, to one's dismay, that even expensive and powerful machines have basic software that is often remarkably "buggy"— thus making any work very frustrating and progress slow.

Even if powerful machines were readily available, with well-functioning basic software, there would still be the need for a good "authoring environment" facilitating the design and implementation of instruction. In particular, an instructional designer and producer must be able to direct his primary attention to fundamental pedagogical issues, without constantly needing to deal with details of low-level programming. The designer also needs to be able to easily edit and easily modify whatever he or she produces, preferably in an environment which is the same as that ultimately seen by the student (i.e., which is WYSIWYG, "what you see is what you get").

During the project we did not have available anything even remotely resembling such an authoring environment — and even now some such environments are only beginning to emerge. Hence we spent considerable time and programming effort trying to bring into existence something which might begin to serve our needs.

"Draw-Ed" authoring environment

David Oster, one of the programmers working on the project, responded to our needs and suggestions by constructing an authoring environment exploiting the Macintosh computer.

This environment uses available Macintosh software, "MacDraw", as an editor which can construct and modify various kinds of objects, including text, graphics, and active elements (e.g., "buttons" which can be clicked by the mouse to produce various specified responses). In this way one can readily construct and edit "frames" (i.e., complex displays ultimately presented to a student) in a way where the author can see exactly what the student will see.

This editor is then coupled to a data-management program (implemented by Oster and called "DrawEd") which consists of the following components to carry out various functions:

Information-transfer between editor and DrawEd. Using "Switcher" (another standard Macintosh software), frames created in the editor can be readily transferred into DrawEd, or transferred back to the editor for easy modification.

Data base. DrawEd stores all frames in convenient pictorial form. These picture frames can be easily accessed either by name, or by browsing through a picture file where any picture can be displayed (either full-size, half-size, or quarter-size) and then visually selected with the mouse.

Interpreter of active elements. Active elements in the MacDraw editor are accompanied by some special symbols and instructions. DrawEd interprets these symbols and instructions so that the active elements actually have the specified effects when selected (e.g., so that buttons selected by the mouse actually lead to the display of specified other frames or windows).

Tutor. DrawEd has an authoring mode and a tutorial mode, and it is very easy to switch between these two. In the authoring mode, DrawEd acts like the data-manager just described. In the tutorial mode it acts as a tutor interacting with the student in the fashion specified by the instructional designer. Thus DrawEd can be used by the designer for authoring and modifying instructional programs; but it can then also be used by a student as a tutor providing instruction.

Transfer to LISP machines. Finally, DrawEd can translate all the information contained in the frames (i.e., text, graphics, and instructions) into LISP and transfer this information electronically (via RS-232 interface) to a Xerox-1108 LISP workstation. This transfer capability has the following advantages: If desired, the Macintosh can be exploited as a cheap and readily available computer acting as a kind of "scratch-pad" (or electronic story-board) where instructional designs can be laid out and perfected up to a certain point. Once this is done, the information may then be transferred electronically to the much more expensive LISP machine for further editing and refinements, so as to exploit the much greater capabilities of those machines.

Final status of computer implementation

The Draw-Ed authoring system became barely functional only near the end of our ONR project. Except for some small-scale testing, the project was thus not able to exploit this system for significant instructional research.

Continuing Work

Although the ONR project terminated last February, some of the lines of work initiated under this project are continuing under different auspices (no longer supported by the ONR). In particular, our current efforts focus more broadly on several cognitive issues involved in the learning and teaching scientific concepts. This domain of investigation seems important not only in its own right, but is also a good prototype domain within which to explore instructional principles of much wider applicability. Since Xerox LISP workstations have become more available to us, we are also increasingly trying to exploit these machines for our instructional work and to create suitable instructional authoring environments for these machines.

References

- Reif, F. (1986). Interpretation of scientific or mathematical concepts: Cognitive issues and instructional implications (Report CES-1). Berkeley, CA: School of Education, University of California. [To be published in Cognitive Science.]
- Reif, F. (1987). Instructional design, cognition, and technology: Applications to the teaching of scientific concepts. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 24, 309-324.
- Labudde, P., Reif, F., & Quinn, L. (1987). Facilitation of scientific concept learning by interpretation procedures and diagnosis. (Report CES-4). Berkeley, CA: School of Education, University of California. [To be published in the European Journal of Science Education.]
- Reif, F. (in press). Interpretation of scientific or mathematical concepts: Cognitive issues and instructional implications Cognitive Science.
- Labudde, P., Reif, F., & Quinn, L. (in press). Facilitation of scientific concept learning by interpretation procedures and diagnosis. European Journal of Science Education.

Dr. Phillip L. Ackerman
University of Minnesota
Department of Psychology
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Dr. Meryl S. Baker
Navy Personnel R & D Center
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Jeff Bonar
Learning R&D Center
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Dr. Beth Adelson
Department of Computer Science
Tufts University
Medford, MA 02155

Dr. Eva L. Baker
Ctr. for the Study of Evaluation
145 Moore Hall, UCLA
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Dr. Gordon H. Bower
Department of Psychology
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94306

AFOSR,
Life Sciences Directorate
Bolling Air Force Base
Washington, DC 20332

prof. dott. Bruno G. Bara
Unita di ricerca di intelligenza artificiale
Universita di Milano
20122 Milano - via F Storza 23 ITALY

Dr. Robert Breaux
Code N-095R
Naval Training Systems Center
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. Robert Ahlers
Human Factors Lab., Code N711
Naval Training Systems Center
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. William M. Bart
Dept. of Ed. Psych., 330 Burton Hall
178 Pillsbury Dr., S.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Dr. Shirley Brice Heath
School of Education
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Ed Aiken
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Leo Beltracchi
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Comm.
Washington, DC 20555

Dr. John S. Brown
XEROX Palo Alto Research Center
3333 Coyote Hill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304

Dr. John R. Anderson
Department of Psychology
Carnegie-Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Mark H. Bickhard
University of Texas
EDB 504 Ed. Psych
Austin, TX 78712

Dr. Ann Brown
Ctr for the Study of Reading
51 Gerty Drive, Univ of Illinois
Champaign, IL 61280

Dr. James Anderson
Brown University
Center for Neural Science
Providence, RI 02912

Dr. Gautam Biswas
Department of Computer Science
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208

Dr. Bruce Buchanan
Computer Science Department
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Steve Andriole
George Mason U/Info Tech & Eng
4400 University Dr.
Fairfax, VA 22030

Dr. John Black
Teachers College, Columbia Univ.
525 West 121st Street
New York, NY 10027

Maj. Hugh Burns
AFHRL/IDE
Lowry AFB, CO 80230-5000

Dr. Gary Aston-Jones
Dept. of Biology, N.Y.U.
1009 Main Bldg., Washington Sq.
New York, NY 10003

Dr. R. Darrell Bock
University of Chicago, NORC
6030 South Ellis
Chicago, IL 60637

Dr. Patricia A. Butler
OERI
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20208

Dr. Patricia Baggett
Dept. of Psych., Box 345
University of Colorado
Boulder, CO 80309

Dr. Sue Bogner
Army Research Institute, (PERI-SF)
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333-5600

Dr. Joseph C. Campione
Ctr. for the Study of Reading
51 Gerty Dr., Univ. of Illinois
Champaign, IL 61820

Joanne Capper
Center for Research into Practice
1718 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC 20009

Chair, Dept of Psych
Georgetown University
Washington, DC 20057

Dr. Charles Clifton
Dept of Psych, Tobin Hall
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003

Dr. Jaime Carbonell
Carnegie-Mellon University
Department of Psychology
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Chair, Dept of Psych
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA 22030

Dr. Allan M. Collins
Bolt Beranek & Newman, Inc.
50 Moulton Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

Dr. Susan Carey
Harvard Grad. School of Ed.
337 Gutman Library, Appian Way
Cambridge, MA 02138

Dr. Fred Chang
Navy Personnel R&D Center
Code 51
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Stanley Collyer
Office of Naval Tech., Code 222
800 North Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Dr. Pat Carpenter
Carnegie-Mellon University
Department of Psychology
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Davida Charney
English Department
Penn State University
University Park, PA 16802

Dr. William Crano
Department of Psychology
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843

LCDR Robert Carter
Office of the Chief of Naval
Operations, OP-01B, Pentagon
Washington, DC 20350-2000

Dr. Paul R. Chatelier
OUSDRE
Pentagon
Washington, DC 20350-2000

Bryan Dallman
3400 TTW/TTGXS
Lowry AFB, CO 80230-5000

Chair
Dept of Computer Sciences
U.S. Naval Academy
Annapolis, MD 21402

Dr. Michelene Chi
University of Pittsburgh, L.R.D.C.
3939 O'Hara Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Laura Davis
NRL/NCARAI Code 7510
4555 Overlook Ave., S.W.
Washington, DC 20375-5000

Chair
Department of Psychology
Towson State University
Towson, MD 21204

Dr. L. J. Chmura
Comp. Sci. and Syst. Branch
Naval Research Lab.
Washington, DC 20375-5000

Defense Technical
Information Center (Attn. T. C.)
Cameron Station, Bldg. 5
Alexandria, VA 22314 (12 copies)

Chair, Department of
Computer Science
Towson State University
Towson, MD 21204

Mr. Raymond E. Christal
AFHRL/MOE
Brooks AFB
San Antonio, TX 78235

Dr. Natalie Dehn
Dept. of Comp. and Info. Science
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403

Chair, Dept of Psych
The Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, MD 21218

Dr. Yee-Yeen Chu
Perceptronics, Inc.
21111 Erwin Street
Woodland Hills, CA 91367-3713

Dr. Gerald F. DeJong
A.I. Grp., Coordinated Sci. Lab.
University of Illinois
Urbana, IL 61801

Chair, Dept of Psych
College of Arts and Sciences
Catholic University of America
Washington, DC 20064

Dr. William Clancey
Knowledge Syst. Lab., Stanford U.
701 Welch Rd., Bldg. C
Palo Alto, CA 94304

Georgy Delacote
Dir. de L'info. Sci. et Tech., CNRS
15, Quai Anatole France
75700 Paris FRANCE

Department
of Computer Science
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93940

Dr. Richard Duran
School of Education
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106

Dr. Paul Feltovich
So Illinois Univ, Sch of Med
Med Educ Dept, P.O. Box 3926
Springfield, IL 62708

Dr. Sharon Derry
Department of Psychology
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Dr. John Ellis
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92252

Mr. Wallace Feurzeig
Ed Tech Ctr, Bolt Beranek & Newman
10 Moulton Street
Cambridge, MA 02238

Director
Manpower and Personnel Lab
NPRDC (Code 06)
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Susan Embretson
University of Kansas
Psych. Dept., 426 Fraser
Lawrence, KS 66045

Dr. Gerhard Fischer
Department of Psychology
University of Colorado
Boulder, CO 80309

Director
Training Laboratory
NPRDC (Code 05)
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Randy Engle
Department of Psychology
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208

Fleet Support Office,
NPRDC (Code 301)
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Director, Human Factors
& Organizational Systems Lab
NPRDC (Code 07)
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Susan Epstein
Hunter College
144 S. Mountain Avenue
Montclair, NJ 07042

J. D. Fletcher
9931 Corsica Street
Vienna, VA 22180

Dr. Andrea A. diSessa
School of Education, EMST
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

ERIC Facility
Acquisitions
4833 Rugby Avenue
Bethesda, MD 20014

Dr. Linda Flower
Carnegie-Mellon University
Department of English
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. R. K. Dismukes
Associate Director for Life Sciences
AFOSR, Bolling AFB
Washington, DC 20332

Dr. K. Anders Ericsson
University of Colorado
Department of Psychology
Boulder, CO 80309

Dr. Kenneth D. Forbus
Dept of Comp Sci, U of Illinois
1304 West Springfield Avenue
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. Stephanie Doan
Code 6021
Naval Air Development Center
Warminster, PA 18974-5000

Dr. Jean Claude Falmagne
Department of Psychology
New York University
New York, NY 10003

Dr. Barbara A. Fox
University of Colorado
Department of Linguistics
Boulder, CO 80309

Dr. Emanuel Donchin
University of Illinois
Department of Psychology
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Beatrice J. Farr
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. John R. Frederiksen
Bolt Beranek & Newman
50 Moulton Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

Dr. Thomas M. Duffy
Communications Design Center
CMU, Schenley Park
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Pat Federico
Code 511
NPRDC
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Norman Frederiksen
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. Michael Friendly
Psych Dept, York University
Toronto Ontario
CANADA M3J 1P3

Dr. Wayne Gray
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Professor John R. Hayes
Carnegie-Mellon University
Dept of Psychology, Schenley Park
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Julie A. Gadsden
Info Tech and Applications Div
Admiralty Research Est
Portsmouth, Portsmouth PO6 4AA U.K.

Dr. James G. Greeno
School of Education
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Barbara Hayes-Roth
Dept of Computer Science
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Michael Genesereth
Stanford University
Computer Science Department
Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Dik Gregory
Behavioral Sciences Division
Admiralty Research Est.
Teddington, Middlesex ENGLAND

Dr. Frederick Hayes-Roth
Teknowledge
525 University Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94301

Dr. Dedre Gentner
Dept of Psych, U of Illinois
603 E Daniel Street
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Gerhard Grossing
Atominstut
Schuttelstrasse 115
Vienna, AUSTRIA a-1020

Dr. Joan I. Heller
505 Haddon Road
Oakland, CA 94606

Dr. Robert Glaser
University of Pittsburgh, LRDC
3939 O'Hara Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Prof. Edward Haertel
School of Education
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Jim Hollan
Intelligent Systems Group
Inst for Cog Sci (C-015), UCSD
La Jolla, CA 92093

Dr. Arthur M. Glenberg
WJ Brogden Psych Bldg
1202 W Johnson St, U of Wisconsin
Madison, WI 53706

Dr. Henry M. Halff
Halff Resources, Inc.
4918 33rd Road, North
Arlington, VA 22207

Dr. Melissa Holland
ARI for the Behavioral and Soc Sci
5001 Eisenhower Ave.
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Sam Glucksberg
Dept of Psych, Green Hall
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ 08540

Dr. Ronald K. Hambleton
Prof of Ed and Psych
U of Mass at Amherst, Hills House
Amherst, MA 01003

Dr. Keith Holyoak
Human Performance Center
U of Michigan, 330 Packard Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Dr. Susan Goldman
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106

Steve Harnad, Editor
The Behavioral and Brain Sciences
20 Nassau Street, Suite 240
Princeton, NJ 08540

Ms. Julia S. Hough
Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
6012 Greene Street
Philadelphia, PA 19144

Dr. Sherrie Gott
AFHRL/MODJ
Brooks AFB, TX 78235

Dr. Wayne Harvey
SRI International
333 Ravenswood Ave, Rm B-S324
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Dr. James Howard, Dept of Psych
Human Performance Lab.
Catholic University of America
Washington, DC 20064

Dr. T. Govindaraj
Georgia Institute of Technology
Sch of Industrial & Syst Eng
Atlanta, GA 30332

Dr. Reid Hastie
Northwestern University
Department of Psychology
Evanston, IL 60201

Dr. Earl Hunt
Department of Psychology
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98105

Dr. Ed Hutchins
Intelligent Systems Group
Inst for Cog Sci (C-015), UCSD
La Jolla, CA 92093

Dr. Douglas A. Jones
Thatcher Jones Assoc.
P.O. Box 6640, 10 Trafalgar Ct.
Lawrenceville, NJ 08648

Dr. Peter Kincaid
Training Analysis & Eval Group
Department of the Navy
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. Barbara Hutson
Virginia Tech Graduate Center
2990 Telestar Ct.
Falls Church, VA 22042

Dr. Marcel Just
Carnegie-Mellon University
Dept of Psych, Schenley Park
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Walter Kintach
Dept of Psych, Campus Box 345
University of Colorado
Boulder, CO 80309

Dr. Barbel Inhelder
University of Geneva
Geneva SWITZERLAND 12U-4

Dr. Daniel Kahneman
The U of BC, Dept of Psych
#154-2053 Main Mall
Vancouver, BC CANADA V6T 1Y7

Dr. David Klahr
Carnegie-Mellon University
Dept of Psych, Schenley Park
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Dillon Inouye
WICAT Education Institute
Provo, UT 84057

Dr. Ruth Kanfer
Dept of Psych, Elliot Hall
75 E River Rd, U of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Dr. Mazie Knerr
Training Research Div, HumRRO
1100 S. Washington
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dr. Alice Isen
Department of Psychology
University of Maryland
Catonsville, MD 21228

Dr. Mary Grace Kantowski
University of Florida, Math Ed
359 Norman Hall
Gainesville, FL 32611

Dr. Janet L. Kolodner
Georgia Institute of Technology
School of Info & Comp Sci
Atlanta, GA 30332

Dr. Robert Jannarone
Department of Psychology
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208

Dr. Milton S. Katz
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Stephen Kosslyn
Harvard U, 1236 William James Hall
33 Kirkland St.
Cambridge, MA 02138

Dr. Claude Janvier, Directeur, CIRAI
Universite' du Quebec a Montreal
Montreal, Quebec H3C 3P8
CANADA

Dr. Frank Keil
Department of Psychology
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853

Dr. Kenneth Kotovsky, Dept of Psych
Comm Coll of Allegheny Co
800 Allegheny Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15233

Dr. Robin Jeffries
Hewlett-Packard Laboratories
P.O. Box 10490
Palo Alto, CA 94303-0971

Dr. Wendy Kellogg
IBM T. J. Watson Research Center
P.O. Box 218
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

Dr. David H. Krantz
2 Washington Square Village
Apt. #15J
New York, NY 10012

Dr. Robert Jernigan
Decision Resource Systems
5595 Vantage Point Road
Columbia, MD 21044

Dr. Dennis Kibler
Dept of Info and Comp Sci
University of California
Irvine, CA 92717

Dr. Benjamin Kuipers
U of TX at Austin, Dept of Comp Sci
T.S. Painter Hall 3.28
Austin, TX 78712

Margaret Jerome
c/o Dr. Peter Chandler
83, The Drive
Hove, Sussex UNITED KINGDOM

Dr. David Kieras
Tech Comm, Coll of Engineering
1223 E. Engineering Bldg, U of MI
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Dr. David R. Lambert
Naval Ocean Syst Ctr, Code 411T
271 Catalina Boulevard
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Pat Langley
Dept of Info & Comp Sci
University of California
Irvine, CA 92717

Dr. Clayton Lewis
Dept of Comp Sci, Campus Box 430
University of Colorado
Boulder, CO 80309

Dr. Barbara Means
Human Resources Research Org
1100 South Washington
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dr. Marcy Lansman
U of NC, Davie Hall 013A
The L.L. Thurstone Lab.
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

Library
Naval Training Systems Center
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. Douglas L. Medin
Dept of Psych, U of Illinois
603 E. Daniel Street
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Jill Larkin
Carnegie-Mellon University
Department of Psychology
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Library, NPRDC
Code P201L
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Military Asst for Training
& Personnel Tech, OUSD (R & E)
Room 3D129, The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301-3080

Dr. Jean Lave
School of Social Sciences
University of California
Irvine, CA 92717

Dr. Jane Malin
Mail Code SR 111
NASA Johnson Space Center
Houston, TX 77058

Dr. George A. Miller
Dept of Psych, Green Hall
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ 08540

Dr. Robert Lawler
Information Sciences, FRL
GTE Labs, Inc., 40 Sylvan Road
Waltham, MA 02254

Dr. William L. Maloy
Chief of Naval Education
and Training, Naval Air Station
Pensacola, FL 32508

Dr. William Montague
NPRDC Code 13
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. Alan M. Lesgold
University of Pittsburgh, LRDC
3939 O'Hara Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Dr. Sandra P. Marshall
Department of Psychology
San Diego State University
San Diego, CA 92182

Dr. Allen Munro
Behavioral Tech Labs - USC
1845 S. Elena Avenue, 4th Floor
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Dr. Jim Levin
Dept of Ed Psych, 210 Ed Bldg
1310 So Sixth St
Champaign, IL 61810-6990

Dr. Manton M. Matthews
Department of Computer Science
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208

Dr. Allen Newell
Carnegie-Mellon University
Dept of Psych, Schenley Park
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. John Levine
University of Pittsburgh, LRDC
3939 O'Hara Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Dr. Richard E. Mayer
Department of Psychology
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106

Dr. Richard E. Nisbett
University of Michigan
Inst for Social Research, Rm. 5261
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Dr. Michael Levine
Ed Psych, 210 Education Bldg
University of Illinois
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Joe McLachlan
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Mary Jo Nissen
University of Minnesota
N218 Elliott Hall
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Matt Lewis
Department of Psychology
Carnegie-Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. James McMichael
Assistant for MPT Research,
Dev, and Studies, OP-0187
Washington, DC 20370

Dr. Harold F. O'Neil, Jr.
School of Ed, WPH 801
Dept of Ed Psych & Tech - USC
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0031

Dr. Michael Oberlin
Naval Training Systems Center
Code 711
Orlando, FL 32813-7100

Dr. Virginia E. Pendergrass
Code 711
Naval Training Systems Center
Orlando, FL 32813-7100

Dr. Joseph Psotka
ATTN: PERI-1C
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue

Office of Naval Research
Code 1142
800 North Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Dr. David N. Perkins
Educational Technology Center
337 Gutman Library, Appian Way
Cambridge, MA 02138

Psychologist
Office of Naval Research
Branch Office, London, Box 39
FPO New York, NY 09510

Office of Naval Research
Code 1133
800 North Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Dr. Nancy Perry, Chief
Naval Ed. and Training, Code 00A2A
Naval Station Pensacola
Pensacola, FL 32508

Psychologist
Office of Naval Research
Liaison Office, Far East
APO San Francisco, CA 96503

Dr. Stellan Ohlsson
University of Pittsburgh, LRDC
3939 O'Hara Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Steven Pinker
Department of Psychology
E10-018, MIT
Cambridge, MA 02139

Dr. Lynne Reder
Department of Psychology
Carnegie-Mellon University
Schenley Park

Dr. Judith Orasanu
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Tjeerd Plomp
Twente U of Tech, Dept of Ed
P.O. Box 217, 7500 AE ENSCHEDE
THE NETHERLANDS

Dr. James A. Reggia
Sch of Med, Dept of Neurology
22 So Greene St, U of Maryland
Baltimore, MD 21201

Professor Seymour Papert
20C-109
MIT
Cambridge, MA 02139

Dr. Martha Polson
Dept of Psych, Campus Box 346
University of Colorado
Boulder, CO 80309

Dr. Frederick Reif
Physics Department
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

Dr. James Paulson
Dept of Psych, Portland State U
P. O. Box 751
Portland, OR 97207

Dr. Peter Polson
University of Colorado
Department of Psychology
Boulder, CO 80309

Dr. Lauren Resnick
University of Pittsburgh, LRDC
3939 O'Hara Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Roy Pea
Bank Street College of Education
610 West 112th Street
New York, NY 10025

Dr. Steven E. Pollock
MCC, Echelon Bldg #1
9430 Research Blvd
Austin, TX 78759-6509

Dr. Gil Ricard
Mail Stop C04-14
Grumman Aerospace Corp.
Bethpage, NY 11714

Dr. Douglas Pearce
DCIEM
Box 2000
Downsview, Ontario CANADA

Dr. Harry E. Pople
U of Pittsburgh, Decision Syst Lab
1360 Scaife Hall
Pittsburgh, PA 15261

Mark Richer
1041 Lake Street
San Francisco, CA 94118

Dr. James W. Pellegrino
Department of Psychology
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106

Dr. Mary C. Potter
Department of Psychology
MIT (E-10-032)
Cambridge, MA 02139

Dr. Mary S. Riley
Program in Cognitive Science
Ctr for Human Info Processing, UCSD
La Jolla, CA 92093

Dr. Linda G. Roberts, Sci, Ed,
& Trans Prog, Tech Assessment
Congress of the United States
Washington, DC 20510

Dr. Judith Segal
OERI
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20208

Special Asst for Marine
Corps Matters, ONR Code 00MC
800 North Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Dr. William B. Rouse
Search Technology, Inc.
25-b Technology Park/Atlanta
Norcross, GA 30092

Dr. Sylvia A. S. Shafto
Department of Computer Science
Towson State University
Towson, MD 21204

Dr. Kathryn T. Spoehr
Brown University
Department of Psychology
Providence, RI 02912

Dr. David Rumelhart
Ctr. for Human Info. Processing
University of California
La Jolla, CA 92093

Dr. Ben Shneiderman
Department of Computer Science
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

Dr. Robert Sternberg
Dept of Psych, Yale University
Box 11A, Yale Station
New Haven, CT 06520

Dr. Roger Schank
Comp Sci Dept, Yale University
P.O. Box 2158
New Haven, CT 06520

Dr. Lee Shulman
Stanford University
1040 Cathcart Way
Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Albert Stevens
Bolt Beranek & Newman, Inc.
10 Moulton Street
Cambridge, MA 02238

Dr. Walter Schneider
University of Pittsburgh, LRDC
3939 O'Hara Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Dr. Robert Siegler
Carnegie-Mellon University
Dept of Psych, Schenley Park
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Thomas Sticht
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Alan H. Schoenfeld
Department of Education, EMST
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

Dr. Derek Sleeman
Stanford University
School of Education
Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. John Tangney
AFOSR/NL
Bolling AFB, DC 20332

Dr. Janet Schofield
University of Pittsburgh, LRDC
3939 O'Hara Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Dr. Edward E. Smith
Bolt Beranek & Newman, Inc.
50 Moulton Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

Dr. Kikumi Tatsuoka
CERL
252 Engineering Research Lab.
Urbana, IL 61801

Karen A. Schriver
Department of English
Carnegie-Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Richard E. Snow
Department of Psychology
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94306

Technical Director, ARI
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Judah L. Schwartz
MIT
20C-120
Cambridge, MA 02139

Dr. Elliot Soloway
Comp Sci Dept, Yale University
P.O. Box 2158
New Haven, CT 06520

Dr. Perry W. Thorndyke
FMC Corp., Central Engineering Labs
1185 Coleman Avenue, Box 580
Santa Clara, CA 95052

Dr. Marc Sebrechts
Department of Psychology
Wesleyan University
Middletown, CT 06475

Dr. Richard Sorensen
Navy Personnel R & D Center
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Professor Chu Tien-Chen
Mathematics Department
National Taiwan University
Taipei, TAIWAN

Dr. Douglas Towne
Behavioral Technology Labs
1845 S. Elena Avenue
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Dr. Robert A. Wisher
Army Inst. for the Beh. and Soc. Sci.
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Kurt Van Lehn
Carnegie-Mellon University
Dept of Psych, Schenley Park
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Mr. John H. Wolfe
Navy Personnel R & D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. Beth Warren
Bolt Beranek & Newman, Inc.
50 Moulton Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

Dr. Wallace Wulfeck, III
Navy Personnel R & D Center
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Donald Weitzman
MITRE
1820 Dolley Madison Blvd.
MacLean, VA 22102

Dr. Joe Yasatuke
AFHRL/LRT
Lowry AFB, CO 80230

Dr. Keith T. Wescourt
FMC Corp, Central Engineering Labs
1185 Coleman Ave, Box 580
Santa Clara, CA 95052

Dr. Masoud Yazdani
Department of Computer Science
University of Exeter
Exeter EX4 4QL Devon, ENGLAND

Dr. Douglas Wetzel
Code 12
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Mr. Carl York
System Development Foundation
181 Lytton Avenue, Suite 210
Palo Alto, CA 94301

Dr. Barbara White
Bolt Beranek & Newman, Inc.
10 Moulton Street
Cambridge, MA 02238

Dr. Joseph L. Young
Memory & Cognitive Processes
National Science Foundation
Washington, DC 20550

Dr. Christopher Wickens
Department of Psychology
University of Illinois
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Heather Wild
Naval Air Development Center
Code 6021
Warminster, PA 18974-5000

Dr. Michael Williams
IntelliCorp
1975 El Camino Real West
Mountain View, CA 94040-2216

END

9-87

DTIC